Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Proceedings at New Haven, October 27th, 1886.

THE Society met at 3 o'clock P. M. in the Library Room of the Divinity School of Yale University. The President, Professor Whitney, being absent, on account of illness, the Vice-president, Rev. Dr. Ward, of New York, took the chair and called the meeting to order.

The Recording Secretary, Professor Lyon, of Cambridge, Mass., read the minutes of the May meeting and they were approved. The Treasurer, Mr. Van Name, announced, on behalf of the Committee of Arrangements, that an invitation had been extended by President Dwight of Yale University for the members to meet socially at his house in the evening, and that the same had been gratefully accepted.

On the part of the Directors, the Corresponding Secretary, Professor Lanman, gave notice that the spring meeting would be held at Boston on the second Wednesday (the 11th day) of May, 1887, and that the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries were to serve as a Committee of Arrangements.

On recommendation of the Directors, the following persons were elected as Corporate Members of the Society:

Prof. Charles R. Brown, Baptist Theological Seminary, Newton Centre, Mass.;
Prof. S. Burnham, Baptist Theological Seminary, Hamilton, N. Y.;
Mr. C. E. Crandall, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.;
Prof. Francis B. Denio, Theological Seminary, Bangor, Maine;
Miss Caroline FitzGerald, New York City;
Mr. Richard J. H. Gottheil, Columbia College, New York City;
Mr. Robert F. Harper, New Haven, Conn.;
Mr. Morris Jastrow, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.;
Rev. Maximilian L. Kellner, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.;
Madame Zénaïde A. Ragozin, San Antonio, Texas.

The Corresponding Secretary laid before the Society a parcel of rubbings of inscriptions from Buddhist convents at Fang shan, some fifteen or twenty miles south-west of Peking. Under date of July 6, 1886, the sender, Mr. Rockhill, writes as follows concerning them: No. 1 is dated in the tenth year Ch'ien T'ung of Tien cha of the Liao of Kitan Tartar dynasty (A. D. 1110). No. 2 is dated in the twelfth year Ta Ting of She tsung of the Kin dynasty (A. D. 1172). No. 3 is of the twenty-third year of the same (A. D. 1183). No. 4 is dated in the sixth year Ch'ien T'ung

of Tien cha (A. D. 1107). No. 7 has the same date as No. 2. The substance of the inscriptions does not seem to be important, except on account of the Sanskrit *dhāraṇīs* and of the Sanskrit quotation written in one of them. Mr. Rockhill adds that this kind of Sanskrit text appears to be the only one now obtainable in or about Peking; and that he hopes to ascertain later on whether there may not be something of interest at Wu t'ai shan, the oldest sanctuary in Northern China.

Protap Chandra Roy, in a letter dated Calcutta, July 17, 1886, describes the way in which the Hindus study their great Epic. Whenever the Bhārata is read, it is read to a group of hearers. The professional reciters, who are all Brahmans, read the poem to larger audiences. They who read are called *pāṭhakas.* Side by side with them sit the *dhārakas* ['supporters'], whose business it is to correct the *pāṭhakas.* Generally it takes about three months to complete the recitation of the entire Mahā Bhārata. [Leaving out the Harivaṅça, this would be at the rate of about one thousand couplets a day.] Both 'readers' and 'supporters' are handsomely paid by those in whose houses the recitations are given. And throughout the entire period, Brahmans are sumptuously fed every day, and are rewarded with the *dakṣinā,* which varies from a four-anna bit to a rupee [about twelve to fifty cents]. At the conclusion of the reading, a large number of persons, chiefly Brahmans, are fed, and large gifts are made to them. There is another class of men called *kathakas,* who sing the Bhārata, draw "bumper" audiences, and receive larger remuneration. Sometimes the *pāṭhakas* recite the poem in the morning and the *kathakas* sing it in the afternoon, the audience of the former being a learned one and that of the latter a miscellaneous one.

Rev. D. Stuart Dodge, through Mr. Van Name, lays before the Society, with a request for suggestions, a scheme for founding a School of Biblical Archæology and Philology in the East. The plan is soon to be more fully set forth in the *Presbyterian Review* by Rev. Henry W. Hulbert, now studying at Beirût, where the school, if established, would probably be located.

The Society now proceeded to the hearing of communications.

1. On the Syriac part of the Chinese Nestorian Tablet; by Prof. I. H. Hall, of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City.

In some quarters it has been the fashion to draw in question the veracity of the old writers on the subject of the Nestorian tablet; particularly of that part which gives the names of seventy preachers of the gospel. The reason for this doubt is the fact that most of the impressions brought to America omit those names. But on comparing the various impressions, scarcely any two are of equal extent, each omitting some part of the stone. Thus there are two in the library of the Auburn Theological Seminary, each partial, and each supplying defects of the other; one at New Haven, showing more than one of the

Auburn impressions, but less than the other; one in the Bible House at New York, showing less than any of those just mentioned; one at Beloit College, showing more than any of them; and so on.

To one who studies the literature of the subject, there can be no doubt that the old writers were in the main correct, and that the seventy names are there. For instance, in J. S. Assemani's *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, tom. ii., pars iii., p. DXXXVIII. ff., the author states that he used two impressions of the stone (*Ex Archetypo desumpta exempla duo consului*), one of which was made (*impressum*) before the year 1631, and the other sent by P. Couplet with many Chinese books to Pope Innocent XI. But in the latter *desiderantur Syriaca nomina septuaginta præconum Evangelii, quæ in altero ad marginem impressa conspiciuntur.*

All the impressions in America have been like this last; that is, they lacked the *edges* of the stone, on which, according to all the accounts, from Athanasius Kircher and Andreas Muller down to Dr. S. Wells Williams, are to be found the seventy names in Syriac. But within a few weeks an impression has come to the American Bible Society, which not only shows the complete face of the stone, but one of the sides complete, and about two-thirds of the other side. Rev. C. Goodrich, a missionary of the A. B. C. F. M., who has seen the stone, thinks it contains the entire inscribed portion. This impression was obtained on the 16th of June, 1886, by Mr. J. Thorne, a well-known colporteur of the American Bible Society. From all considerations that appear in the literature of the subject, this impression must be much the best that has ever been consulted by any of the writers who have treated it. It shows a number of diacritic points, and marks of punctuation, which could not have been seen by Assemani; and the impression enables me to correct a number of mistakes of both Assemani and Kircher; and, at the same time, to decide between the two when they differ.

Unfortunately, the side on which most of these seventy names occur is disfigured by a late Chinese inscription, which cuts into the Syriac and the old Chinese in places, and commemorates the setting up of the stone in 1859, in the position stated by Dr. Williams in *The Middle Kingdom*. But this new inscription rarely interferes with the reading of the Syriac, making hopeless only one of the seventy names, and that one about which Kircher and Assemani differ.

Whether the extra twenty-four names which Kircher gives in his *Prodromus Coptus* exist on that part of the stone which the Bible House impression does not cover, or whether, as Assemani maintained, Kircher forged them, cannot be said. But the twenty-four names read as if Kircher had made a double copy of part of the inscription, and got his two sets of notes confused.

In this summary only a few points of the communication can be noticed. The chief errors in Assemani's reading of the Syriac are here given; reference to Assemani being made by his "Classes," on pp. DXLII. to DXLVI., in the volume and part above mentioned, which include all that is on the impression of the edges of the stone. The impression of the face of the stone, given by Assemani, *ubi supra*, pp. DXLVIII. to DL., can be compared on many of the impressions,

Classis I. No. 8, Assemani ܐܝܣܚܩ (Isaac), wrong for ܐܦܪܝܡ (Ephraim). No. 9, Assemani ܐܝܣܚܩ (Isaac), wrong for ܐܒܝ (Abi).

Classis II. No. 1, Assemani ܐܩܩ ("Acacius"), wrong for ܒܟܘܣ (Bakus, or Bacchus); also, Assemani wrongly has a ܘ (*waw*) prefixed to the last word; and he has the same mistake with the last word of No. 2. No. 5, Assemani wrongly ܘܕܝܪܝܐ for ܕܩܒܪܐ. No. 6, Assemani wrongly ܝܘܚܢܢ for ܝܘܚܢܢܝܣ: that is, has the form *Yuhanan* instead of *Yohannes;* also wrongly ܘܕܝܪܝܐ for ܘܝܕܐ.

Classis III. No. 3, Assemani wrongly ܐܝܘܢܝܣ (*Yoannes*), for ܐܝܘܒ (Job). In this instance Kircher is right. No. 13, Assemani wrongly ܝܘܚܢܢ (John), for ܢܘܚ (Noah). In this instance also Kircher is right.

Classis IV. No. 1. In this instance it is impossible to decide between Kircher and Assemani, for the new Chinese inscription has mutilated the letters too badly. Nos. 4 and 7, Assemani wrongly ܡܪܝ for ܡܪ.

Classis V. No. 2, Assemani wrongly ܡܪܝ for ܡܪ; and, what is more important, wrongly ܕܨܝܢܣܬܐܢ (of Sinistân, i. e. of China), for ܫܝܢܓܬܣܘܐ (Shiangtsû). It is astonishing that he should make such a blunder, for the "of Sinistān" occurs elsewhere in the inscription, on the face of the stone. No. 3, Assemani wrongly ܓܪܝܓܘܪ for ܓܝܓܘܝ; and wrongly omits the connecting prefix *waw* of the last word, materially changing the sense. No. 11, Assemani wrongly omits the word at the end, ܘܣܒܐ.

Classis VI. No. 1, Assemani wrongly ܩܫܝܫܐ (priest), for ܩܢܘܢܐ (canon). Nos. 2 and 3, Assemani wrongly adds ܩܫܝܫܐ (there never could have been any such word on the stone, for the old Chinese fills the place). No. 7, ܡܪ ܣܪܓܝܣ (Mar Sergius), is the correct reading; Assemani and Kircher are both wrong; the first reading ܝܥܩܘܒ (Jacob), the second reading ܡܪ ܝܘܣܦ (Mar Joseph). No. 10, Assemani wrongly ܐܠܝܐ (Elias), for ܙܟܪܝܐ (Zecharias). No. 12, Assemani wrongly ܩܘܪܝܩܘܣ (Cyriacus), for ܒܟܘܣ (Bakus, or Bacchus).

Classis VII. No. 1, Assemani omits a *yud* after the *rish*, in the name.

The corrections to be made in Assemani and Kircher's representation of the face of the stone are much less considerable.

Other matters of the communication, historical, descriptive, geographical, bibliographical, and palæographical, are omitted here for the sake of brevity. The full communication, when printed, will contain also the complete Syriac text of the stone.

2. On a newly discovered Syriac Manuscript; by Prof. Hall.

Some two or three years ago a manuscript in Ancient Syriac was found in a church in the village Minganish in Tiary (in Kûrdistân), and copied by Rabban Yonan (ܪܒܢ ܝܘܢܢ, Rabban Jonah), the only remaining Nestorian monk of the village. The copy was brought to Urmî (Oroomiah) in 1885, by Kasha Oshana (ܩܫܐ ܐܘܫܥܢܐ, Priest Osha'na, or Ausha'na), who has been engaged with the Rev. Benjamin Labaree in revising the Modern Syriac translation of the Old Testament.

Other copies were then taken from the original, among which mine was made by David of Targawar, the son of Deacon Jacob, during the present year, for Rev. Mr. Labaree, and by the latter transferred to me. The original, I am informed by Mr. Labaree, is at Kochannis in Kûrdistân, the seat of the patriarchal residence, and is the property of the patriarch (as a corporation sole). The present patriarch is Mar Simon (ܡܪܝ ܫܡܥܘܢ), but the literary man or scribe in charge is the patriarch's secretary, Rabban Yonan, above-named. I think that the first intelligence brought to America respecting the manuscript was sent by the Rev. Mr. Shedd, one of our missionaries in Persia. It awakened great interest among the Nestorians; and a translation of it into Modern Syriac was made orally by Kasha Oshana, put into writing by Mr. Shedd, and published in the ܙܗܪܐ ܕܢܗܪܐ ('Rays of Light'), a monthly published by the mission at Oroomiah; the translation being spread through eight numbers, from *Keri I.*, i. e. Autumn I., or Tishri I., October, 1885, to Iyyar, or May, 1886. The original is said to be a quarto of about 160 pages. My copy is a quarto of 128 pages, the written part of the page $6\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in dimension, and 18 lines to the page; the writing beautiful Nestorian, very fully pointed.

The Syriac title of the manuscript is ܬܫܥܝܬܐ ܕܡܪܝ ܝܘܐܢܢ ܩܬܘܠܝܩܐ ܘܪܒܢ ܣܘܡܐ ܡܪܒܝܐ ܕܡܕܝܢܬܐ. ܐܝܟ ܕܟܬܒ ܫܡܗ ܕܡܪ ܝܘܐܢܢ ܩܬܘܠܝܩܐ ܘܪܒܢ ܣܘܡܐ that is, History of Mar Yawallaha (or, in Jacobite, Yaballaha), catholic [patriarch] of the East, and of Rabban Sauma, general bishop (or, deputy general, or vicar general). No date, and no author's name, appears; nor have the American missionaries any clue to the date of the original manuscript at Kochannis. But the first writer or author was plainly both contemporary and native, or to the manner born; and since the latest date mentioned in the MS. is Nov. 15, 1629 of the Selucid era, = A. D. 1317, we have a pretty good approximation to the date.

Not to go into a discussion of the historical connections of this MS. with other literature, it may be stated that it is unique in presenting the matters from a Nestorian standpoint, besides containing a number of matters not elsewhere related. Yawallaha (Jaballaha) is repeatedly mentioned in Assemani's *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, as are others of the same name. On p. 620 of tom iii., pars. i., he is set down as the 82d in Assemani's list of the Patriarchs of the Chaldeans or Nestorians, compiled from "Mari, Amro, Bar-hebræo, et aliis." Assemani elsewhere calls him Jaballaha III. Our MS. covers about the entire period of the patriarchate of Jaballaha, as Assemani gives it; and his dates agree pretty closely with those of the MS. Assemani, however, gives the date of his death as the end of Saturday before the 3d Sunday of Church dedication, the 13th of November, in the year of the Greeks 1629. This MS. therefore laps over the death of Gregory Bar Hebræus, and furnishes a parallel document with his chronicles. The Syriac scholar will immediately see in how many interesting directions its connections lead, and of how great value it is.

The introduction and title are in the usual style of Syrian authors. Then follows an essay in the missionary spirit and view; for the further-

ance of which the author writes the events he treats of, "everything just as it was."

First is the story of Rabban Sauma; then the early history of Mar Yawallaha; then the journey of the two westward. The original start of Mar Yawallaha was from his native place Kûshang, in the East, and was made with a view to becoming an ecclesiastic. Fifteen days' travel brought him to Rabban Sauma, whose disciple he became. After three years' service he became very eager to go westward, and to visit the shrines of the martyrs and Jerusalem. After much persuasion he induced Rabban Sauma to go; and the two gave all they had to the poor, and started, though not without much opposition.

The narrative is interesting. They pass the city Tangût, the country of Lûtûn, thence to Kashgar, to the city Tleos, and to a church called Mar Zion near the city Tûs. Thence to Azerbaijan and to Baghdad. Thence they go to Marga, to Beth Garma, to Arbîl, to Mosul, to Singara, Nisibin; to the island of Beth Zodai; visiting shrines everywhere. After some retracing of steps and some trouble, they obtain from King Abaka permission to go to Jerusalem.

On the journey Mar Yawallaha (formerly Mark, son of Beni-el) is made Metropolitan of Katai and Aung, and Sauma is made deputy of the churches. Detained by a war, Mar Yawallaha has remarkable dreams and adventures, and finally is ordained patriarch at the church Kuka, near Baghdad, on Saturday, 24 November, 1593 of the Greeks (A. D. 1281). This date, as well as the main history, agrees with Assemani's account, so far as the two are parallel, except that Assemani gives the day as 1st Sunday of Dedication of a church—i. e., that whose antiphon and lessons have that reference. At that time Mar Yawallaha was 37 years old.

After many adventures he came to Oroomiah, and thence to Maraga. Under King Argoun, he rebuilt his church at Maraga, and cloisters for himself also. Argoun proposed to conquer Syria and Palestine if the Western Christians would join him; and, after consulting Mar Yawallaha, sent, on the latter's recommendation, Rabban Sauma as ambassador to the pope and the kings of the West, providing him liberally with supplies, and presents for the Western powers.

Rabban Sauma's journey then takes place. He goes by the Black Sea to Constantinople, and is received with great honor by the Greek emperor. Is much impressed with Santa Sophia, and other things beyond his power of expression. He sails to Naples, goes thence to Rome, and meets the cardinals—the pope having recently died. From Rome to "Tuzaban" (Tuscany?), thence to Genoa, thence through a country called Unbar to Paris, thence (apparently) to England, or, at least, 20 days' journey to the king of England. Thence to the city of Gîwa, in winter, where things were green all the year; thence to Rome, where he met the pope, transacted his business, and returned to King Argoun, by the same route by which he came. This was in the year of the Greeks 1598=A. D. 1287.

The rest of the manuscript is taken up with chronicles of the years from 1599 (A. D. 1288) to 1623 (A. D. 1312), giving accounts of matters

among the Nestorians. The death of Rabban Sauma occurred in 1605 (A. D. 1294); and the death of Mar Yawallaha is mentioned, as above stated, as occurring in the year of the Greeks 1629. The MS. agrees with Assemani within *two days* respecting this date: "And he departed the night of Sunday of ܡܐ ܥܒܝܫ ܡܥܟܪܟ [the words that begin the ritual of that day], on the 15th of the latter Tishri" [November].

In this sketch it is impossible to hint at the interesting and valuable matter of the narrative. But the MS. is in every way worth publishing entire.

3. Some Arabic proverbs; collected by Mr. James Richard Jewett, Fellow of Harvard College, now studying in Syria.

Mr. Jewett has collected three or four hundred proverbs in the common dialect;* and of these he sent fifty, from Aleih, September 2, 1886. Some of those which he sent have been omitted, because they are given by Khouri or by Landberg.

1. *rāḥ el ḥmār ḥatta yesta'îr qurûn, reji' bela dœnaîn.* 'The ass went to borrow horns; he came back without ears.' Used of one who loses what he already has in the effort to get more.

2. *kull ma ji't btäkul ṭâiyyib.* 'The hungrier you are, the better you will eat.'

3. *min qillœt el chēl šeddu 'al kiläb surûj.* 'From lack of horses they fasten saddles on the dogs.' *'al* is for *'ala 'l.*

4. *ed dîk 'âlamu mezbiltu.* 'The cock's world is his dunghill.'

5. *rœkkœbnäk warâna, meddêt îdœk 'al churj.* 'We mounted you behind us and you have stretched your hand to the saddle-bag.' Applied to one who has repaid kindness with treachery.

6. *ill bīrûḥ lᵃ bên el 'ūrân beddu ya'wir 'aînu.* 'He who goes among the one-eyed must blind his eye,' i. e. render himself one-eyed. *ill* for *illéḏi.* When you go to Rome, do as the Romans do.

7. *'allemnäk eš šḥâdi, sabaqtna 'al bûb.* 'We taught you begging (and) you have outstripped us to the doors' (and thus deprived us of what we might get; for when we go to any house begging, you have been there before us, and now we get nothing). Applied to one who uses assistance given by another to that other's disadvantage. *bûb* plural of *bäb.*

8. *ill byiḥtäj lil kelb bīqúlluh ya ḥäjj kelb.* 'He who needs a dog says to him, "Mr. Dog."' Applied in case a man "having an axe to grind" uses a little flattery. *ḥäjj,* 'pilgrim,' is a title of respect given to those who have made the pilgrimage to Mecca.

9. *ill bīlâ'ib el quṭṭ beddu yilqa charamîšu.* 'He who plays with the cat will get its scratches.'

---

* Transliteration. ا = ; ح = *ḥ*; خ = *ch*; ذ = *ḏ*; ش = *š*; ص = *ṣ*; ض = *ḍ*; ط = *ṭ*; ظ = *ẓ*; ع = ʿ; غ = *gh*; ق = *q*. The *œ* designates a sound like that in English *hat;* and *ä*, a sound like that in German *Väter*. A macron over a vowel denotes a long sound; a circumflex denotes a long and accented one. And *ä* is always to be understood as long and accented, as if marked with a circumflex.

10. *la aḥad byišterī semek bil moi.* 'No one buys fish in the water.'

11. *išbi' kelbœk yaḥmi dârœk jauwwi' bissœk yäkul fârœk.* 'Satisfy your dog, he will defend your house. Starve your cat, she will eat your mouse.'

12. *qâlu lid dîk ṣîḥ, qâl kull šî bwaqtu mlîḥ.* 'They said to the cock, "Crow." He said, "Everything is good in its time."'

13. *min chaufu min es suchn ṣâr yinfuch 'al leben.* 'From his fear of heat he began to blow on the *leben.*' Leben is a preparation of milk much esteemed by the natives as well as by many Europeans residing in Syria. It is prepared by putting some fermenting substance in sweet milk. It looks like our curds, but is quite a different thing. It is always most refreshingly cool; hence the proverb.

14. *harab min ed dubb, waqa' fi 'l jubb.* 'He fled from the bear. (and) fell into the well.' Out of the frying-pan into the fire.

15. *min ed delfi li taḥt el mizräb.* 'From the drops (to) under the spout.' By *delfi* is meant the water which trickles down through the earthen roofs after or during a rain. The *mizräb* is a wooden spout two or three feet long set in the edge of the roof to drain off the water from the roof, and send it away from the foundations of the house when it rains. The meaning is the same as that of the preceding proverb. In seeking to avoid a few drops one sometimes gets a thorough drenching. Given by Khouri and by Landberg.

16. *zawwajt binti lachluṣ min balâha, ijítnī u arba' min warâha.* 'I married off my daughter to get rid of the care (trouble) of her, she came to me and four behind her.' *lachluṣ* for *li achluṣ.*

17. *ma fî dibs illa fī Ba'albek?* 'Is there no molasses except in Baalbek?' *Dibs* is the name of the molasses made from grapes for which Baalbek is famous. *fî* means 'there is.'

18. *šaḥḥâd u mšâriṭ?* 'A beggar and making conditions?' Beggars shouldn't be choosers.

19. *mitl ḥmâr ez zayyät kull ma nadahu ṣâḥbu byûqaf.* 'Like the oil-seller's donkey, the more his master calls him the more he stops.'

20. *wœkkœl el quṭṭ bil jibnät.* 'He put the rat in charge of the cheeses.' Same meaning as in No. 21.

21. *mitl illi bīwœ'kkil ed dubb bil kœrm.* 'Like the man who puts the bear in charge of the vineyard.' Bears are fond of grapes and make ravages in vineyards.

22. *ta yᵉšîb el ghrâb.* 'Till the crow grows white.'

23. *il 'âdi tiqta' charazit il bîr.* 'Custom cuts through the curbstone of the well.' That is, a groove is worn in the curb of a well by repeatedly drawing up water and dragging the rope over the stone. The *charazi* is a large stone placed over the mouth of a well and has a round hole in it through which buckets are let down. I have seen stones which had been deeply grooved by the rope.

24. *ṭ'âm wâḥid byišbi' tnên.* 'The food of one will satisfy two.' That is, it costs little more for a family of say five or six, than it does for one of four or five.

25. *'ašrat il chānätī rawwaḥit ḥmâr il mkäri.* 'The khan-keeper's ten paras made the muleteer loose his donkey (lit. made the donkey of

the muleteer go away).' The explanation of this is said to be that a muleteer refusing to pay ten paras (about a cent) to the khan-keeper for the privilege of tying his donkey in the khan, tied the beast outside and it was stolen.

26. *ill ma'u mäl yäkul rizz wiṣfîḥa will ma ma'u mäl byitneššaq 'ar rîḥa.* 'He who has money eats rice and *ṣfîḥa* and he who has no money smells the scent.' *ṣfîḥa* is the name of a native dish of meat cut very fine and put on circular pieces of dough having the edges turned up. The whole then is baked. It is like little meat pies with bottom crust but no top one.

27. *mitl el ḥamîr el bîḍ la yeḥibb illa 'l marmagha.* 'Like white donkeys, he likes nothing but rolling (in the dust).'

28. *el matraḥ ḍayyiq wel ḥmâr lebbâṭ.* 'The place is narrow and the donkey is a great kicker.' Used in case everything seems to be against a man, with somewhat of the meaning of our proverb "misfortunes never come single."

29. *ir rédī rédī, kull ma jlaîtu ṣidi.* 'The bad is bad (what's bad is bad); the more you polish it, the more it rusts.'

30. *širwäl mä lu, dikktu barba'taš.* 'Trowsers he has none, but his suspenders cost fourteen piasters' (according to another version, 'two dollars' *biryälain*). *širwäl* are the baggy trowsers of the Syrians. The *dikki*, 'girdle,' which I translate by 'suspenders,' is in reality a cord passed through a hem in the top of the trowsers and used to fasten them around the waist.

31. *ḏkûr id dîb u hayyi 'l qaḍîb.* 'Speak of the wolf and get ready the stick.' Like our "Speak of angels and you will hear the rustling of their wings."

32. *min kän id dîk dalîlu kän el qinn ma'wäh.* 'He who has the cock for guide has the hen-house for his abode.'

33. *dæbbir il jâr qabl ed dâr wer rafîq qabl eṭ ṭarîq.* 'Arrange for your neighbor before your house, and your companion before your route.'

34. *el qird ba'in immu ghazäl.* 'The monkey is in his mother's eye a gazelle.'

35. *il ma'na bqalb eš šä'ir.* 'The meaning is in the heart of the poet.' That is, the poet alone knows what he intended to express. This seems to be particularly true of some Arabic poetry.

36. *byis'al 'an il baiḍa mîn bâḍha wij jäji mîn jäbha.* 'He asks about the egg, "What (hen) laid it?" and about the hen, "Who brought it?"'

37. *lau bīšûf ij jæmel ḥirdebbtu kän byiqa' byiksur raqbtu.* 'If the camel should see his hump, he would fall and break his neck.'

38. *beddu ye'azzi u ma bya'rif mîn mät.* 'He wishes to offer his condolence and he does not know who has died.'

39. *ma bya'rif el elif mîn el mädni.* 'He does not know an elif from a minaret.' Like our "He doesn't know *b* from a bull's foot."

40. *la tiḥki ya lisän bil ḥaît fî insän.* 'Do not speak, O tongue; in the wall there is a man.' Walls have ears.

41. *el fels es säyib bī'allim en näs es sirqa.* 'Money (lying about) loose teaches people theft.'

42. *il faras il aṣîli la yᵉ'îbha jlälha.* 'The mare of good blood is not disgraced by her pack-saddle (lit. her pack-saddle does not disgrace her).'

43. *a'qal min el berghût bid dän.* 'More cunning than a flea in the ear.'

4. Two Hymns of the Atharva-Veda, ii.11 and vi.128; by Prof. M. Bloomfield, of Baltimore, Md.

This paper gives further contributions to the exegesis of the Atharvan, based on the ritualistic books pertaining to that Veda, and in confirmation of what was presented in the Proceedings for May, 1885, and May, 1886, vol. xiii. of the Journal.

I. Atharva-Veda ii.11. This hymn has been translated by Weber, *Ind. Stud.* xiii.163. He entitles it 'The *srāktya*-amulet, a counter-incantation.' The purpose of the hymn is doubtless correctly stated, as is clear from stanzas 2 and 3. He bases his description of the *sraktya* amulet, or *srāktya*, as it is called at viii.5.4,7,8, simply on an etymology, and derives the words from *srakti*, 'corner,' and defines them as 'many-cornered.' Accordingly, he thinks that the amulet in question was made of a polished jewel or crystal. Similarly Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 263.

The word *sraktya* occurs in a long list of plants and trees, enumerated as *çānta* or 'holy' in the Kāuçika sūtra, viii.15. Dārila defines it by *tilaka*. Moreover, at xxxix.1, a sūtra which serves as rubric to the hymn now in question, the word *srāktya* occurs thus: *dūṣyā dūṣir asī 'ti srāktyam badhnāti;* and on this Dārila's comment is *çāntyudakānte bandhanam . . . sraktyavikāraḥ, sraktyamaṇiḥ, sraktyas tilakaḥ, kṛtyā-çamanārtham.*

According to this the *sraktya* is a kind of *tilaka*-tree. Since it is reckoned as *çānta*, we may infer that it was 'suitable for warding off witchcraft,' or *pratyabhicaraṇa;* for there is a common and technical antithesis between *çānti* and *abhicāra* in the ritual. Thus the Atharvaṇīya-paddhati of the Kāuçika says in the introduction, *saṁhitāvidhiṁ vakṣyāmaḥ; çāntika-pāuṣṭikā-"bhicārikāṇi saṁhitāvidhāu* (i. e. in the Kāuçika) *uktāni, trividhāni karmāṇi vidhikarmāṇi avidhikarmāṇi uchrayakarmāṇi.* And Dārila glosses *çāntānām*, occurring at Kāuçika iii.19, by *nā "bhicārikāṇām.* The word *srāktya* is a regular *vṛddhi*-derivative from *sraktya*, and means 'amulet made from the *sraktya*-tree.' Support is thus furnished for the unauthenticated meaning of *tilakā*, 'eine art halsschmuck,' reported by Böhtlingk in the smaller dictionary.

The vegetable kingdom is a favorite source of the *maṇi* or amulet. Thus amulets are furnished by a number of the 'holy' trees mentioned at Kāuçika viii.15: so by the *udumbara*, AV. xix.31.1; the *parṇa* or *palāça*, iii.5; the *jañgiḍa*, ii.4; xix.35; the *varaṇa*, vi.85; x.3. An amulet consisting of a pair of equal *kṛṣṇalā*-berries, *yugmakṛṣṇalam*, is mentioned at Kāuçika xi.19 and lii.18. The hymn AV. ii.9 sings the praises of the *daçavṛkṣa*, which the Kāuçika and Dārila explain as an amulet consisting of ten different kinds of 'holy' wood; compare *Ind. Stud.* xiii.153–155. Finally, as appears at Kāuçika xxviii.7, the *sadam-*

puṣpā furnishes an amulet employed in connection with the hymn AV. iv.20.

It may be added that the use of this hymn, ii.11, in connection with iv.40; 17; 18; 19; v.14; 31; viii.5; and x.1, is enjoined by the Kāuçika at xxxix.7, thus: *dūṣyā dūṣir asi ye purastād īçānāṁ tvā samaṁ jyotir uto asy abandhukṛt suparṇas tvā yāṁ te cakrur ayam pratisaro yāṁ kalpayantī 'ti mahāçāntim āvapate.* These pratīkas, with the addition of those of vii.65.1,2, make up the second *gaṇa* of the *gaṇamālā*, Atharva-pariçiṣṭa 34, which bears the name of *kṛtyāgaṇa*. The purpose of the hymn is clear from the Anukramaṇī, which says, *dūṣyā dūṣir asī 'ti kṛtyāpratiharaṇasūktaṁ kṛtyādūṣaṇadevatyam.*

The hymn is mentioned also in the *hastyaçvadīkṣā*, Ath. Pariçiṣṭa xvii. 2: *dūṣyā dūṣir iti pratisaram ābadhya* (MSS. *āv-*). And a passage in praise of the *pratisara* occurs in the *skandayāga* or *dhūrtakalpa*, ib. xx.6,7. Dārila's comment on Kāuçika xix.22 treats of the *pratisara*. As appears from Weber, l.c., xiii.164, Zimmer, l.c., p. 263, and Ludwig, *Rigveda*, iii.345, the earlier meaning of *pratisara* does not seem to be clearly established, and the *skandayāga*-passage may therefore be given in full: in çloka 5*a*, the MS.-reading is *kṛtāt pātaḥ kṣudrāt*, with the variant *kṣudrāḥ*. The passage follows: *ādityakartitaṁ sūtram iti pratisaram badhnāti.* 6.

ādityakartitaṁ sūtram indreṇa trivṛtīkṛtam
açvibhyāṁ granthito granthir brahmaṇā pratisaraḥ kṛtaḥ.
dhanyaṁ yaçasyam āyuṣyam açubhasya ca ghātanam
badhnāmi pratisaram imaṁ sarvaçatrunibarhaṇam.
rakṣobhyaç ca piçācebhyo gandharvebhyas tathāi 'va ca
manuṣyebhyo bhayaṁ nā 'sti yac ca syād duṣkṛtaṁ kṛtam.
svakṛtāt parakṛtāc ca duṣkṛtāt parimucyate
sarvasmāt pātakān mukto bhaved vīras tathāi 'va ca.
abhicārāt kṛtāt kṣudrāt strīkṛtād açubhaṁ ca yat
tāvat tasya bhayaṁ nā 'sti yāvat sūtraṁ sa dhārayet.
yāvad āpaç ca gāvaç ca yāvat sthāsyanti parvatāḥ
tāvat tasya bhayaṁ nā 'sti yaḥ sūtraṁ dhārayiṣyati.

II. Atharva-Veda vi.128. This hymn has been translated by Weber, *Omina und Portenta*, p. 363, and by Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 353. The latter, following a suggestion of the Petersburg Lex., vii.11, regards the hymn as one in praise of an otherwise unknown constellation called *Çakadhūma*, which has the power of bringing good weather. And Ludwig, *Rigveda* iii., p. 187, adopts incidentally a similar view of Max Müller's. Zimmer accordingly renders AV. vi.128.1 thus: 'When the stars made Çakadhūma their king, they offered him good weather; "this shall be his domain," said they.' Stanzas 2 and 3 are prayers to Çakadhūma for good weather, and stanza 4 contains thanks to Çakadhūma for the same.

Weber's translation is made from a text—given below—which differs from the vulgate text of our hymn in form rather than in content. This text is put by the diaskeuasts as an appendix immediately after the Nakṣatra-kalpa, and it is placed here probably on account of the frequent occurrence in it of the word *nakṣatra*. The last three stanzas are

excessively corrupt, and their connection with what precedes is not clear. They begin with an incantation against *yakṣma*, 'consumption.' With such an incantation the immediately preceding hymn, AV. vi.127, ends. And this fact, with the legend of the origin of the disease at TS. ii.3.5, may throw some light on the juxtaposition of these obscure stanzas with this *nakṣatra*-material. It would be interesting to find this text in the Kaçmīr Saṁhitā, if indeed the *pāippalādās* of the colophon warrants such an expectation.

yad rājānaṁ çakadhūmaṁ[1] *nakṣatrāṇy akṛṇvata*
bhadrāham asmāi prāyachat[2] *tato rāṣṭram ajāyata.* 1.
bhadrāham astu naḥ sāyam bhadrāham prātar astu naḥ
bhadrāham asmabhyaṁ tvaṁ çakadhūma sadā kṛṇu. 2.
yo no bhadrāham akaraḥ sāyamprātar atho divā
tasmāi te nakṣatrarāja çakadhūma sadā namaḥ. 3.
yad āhuḥ çakadhūmam āha[3] *nakṣatrāṇām prathamajaṁ jyotir agre*
tan naḥ[4] *satīm abhikṛṇotu rayiṁ ca naḥ sarvavīraṁ niyachāt.* 4.
yo 'smin yakṣmaḥ[5] *puruṣe praviṣṭa iṣitaṁ dāivyaṁ ha saḥ*
agniṣṭhaṁ[6] *ghṛtabodhano 'pa skanda no vi dūram asmat*
so 'nyena sāmṛchatā[7] *tasmāi prasuvāmasi.* 5.
yas tvā mātur uta va pituḥ parijāyamānam abhisambabhūva
na tvad yam adhināsāyāmāsā[8] *'nyasmāi sa yātāiḥ praviṣṭaḥ.* 6.
aliklavā[9] *gṛdhrāḥ kaṅkāḥ suparṇāḥ çvapadaḥ*[10] *patatriṇaḥ*
vayo 'si çakuna yo 'muṣyā 'muṣyāyaṇasyā 'muṣyāḥ putrasyā "dahane carantu.[11] 7.

kṛttikārohiṇīmadhye pāippalādā mantrāḥ.

Weber renders stanzas 1 and 4 thus: 'When the stars chose Çakadhūma for their king, good weather was given [*gab man*] to him. From that arose his kingship.' . . . 'Inasmuch as Ç. is called the light of the stars, first-born in the beginning, therefore may he grant us prosperity, and give us wealth with a goodly following.' Weber, recognizing *çakadhūma* as the word on which the interpretation depends, takes it as equivalent to the *çakamaya dhūma* of RV. i.164.43, 'the smoke that rises from burning cow-dung,' a well-known fuel—see Haug, *Sitzungsberichte der bair. Ak.*, 1875, ii., p. 506—and surmises that it may be the first morning fire, kindled while the stars are still shining, and indicating by its rising or falling smoke the weather of the breaking day.[12]

The Atharvan ritual-books yield an interpretation quite different. The hymn is in praise of *çakadhūma*, which, as a possessive compound, means 'he of the dung-smoke,' i. e. 'he who prophesies from the smoke of cow-dung.' The *çakadhūma* predicts the weather for a person about to start on a journey—see below. As weather-prophet, he very natu-

---

[1] So Codex Chambers and the published text. Three MSS. read *çāka-*.

[2] So all MSS. Weber emends to *prāyachaṅs;* cf. AV. vi.128.1.

[3] So all MSS. Weber, *ăha.*

[4] Variants, *taṁ naḥ, taṁ vaḥ.*

[5] MSS. *yakṣma.*

[6] Read *agniṣṭha?*

[7] Read *sam-ṛchatāt*, 2d s. imperative?

[8] ? One MS. *adhināsayāsāmā.*

[9] So emended. MSS. *alikla, aliṣya.*

[10] One MS. *çvāpadaḥ.*

[11] One MS. *daraṁtu.*

[12] See also Weber, *Ind. Stud.* v.257; x.65; *Die vedischen Nachrichten von den Nakṣatra*, ii.272 note, and 393.

rally comes, like our "Old Probabilities" or "Clerk of the Weather," to be regarded at the same time as controlling the weather for good or bad—in short, as weather-maker. Control of the weather, as a delegated power, would come most naturally from the 'heavenly bodies' or *nakṣatrāṇi*. Hence these are said in stanza 1 to have made him their king. The belief that the bestowal of fair weather was a prerogative of his kingship of course ensured him reverential treatment, and was doubtless fostered by the priests. In accordance with the above, the translations of the hymn may be easily modified.[1]

The word *çakadhūma* occurs at Kāuçika viii.17, a *paribhāṣā-sūtra*, thus, *pramando-'çīra-çalaly-upadhāna-çakadhūmā jarantaḥ*. Dārila says, *çakadhūma* (!) *brāhmaṇaḥ . . . etāni jīrṇāni pratyetavyāni*. We may render, 'When in the following sūtras there are mentioned the plants *pramanda* and *uçīra*, a boar's bristle, an *upadhāna*, or a *çakadhūma*, it is to be understood that old ones are meant.' It is clear, then, that the *çakadhūma* is an old brahman.

In the wedding-ritual, Kāuçika lxxvi.19, we learn from one sūtra that the priest causes the groom to take the bride's hand, uttering the stanza AV. xiv.1.48. In the next sūtra, it is said that he leads her thrice around the fire with a certain other text. Between the two sūtras, the Daça karmāṇi[2] inserts the statement, *atra sthāne sūryāpāṭham*[2] *paṭhati*, and the Atharvaṇīya-paddhati,[2] *atra sthāne catvāraḥ çakadhūmāḥ sūryāpāṭhaṁ*[3] *kurvanti*. From this it appears that the priestly function of reciting the 'wedding-song' was sometimes entrusted to the *çakadhūma*'s.

This hymn, vi.128, is prescribed at Kāuçika l.13 as part of the ritual of a traveling merchant when about to start on a trading expedition. 'With the hymn AV. iii.15 (see *Ind. Stud.* xvii.247) he sets up his wares after touching them with dregs of sacrificial butter.' Sūtra 13 reads, *nimṛjya digyuktābhyāṁ doṣo gāya pātaṁ na iti pañcā 'naḍudbhyo yamo mṛtyur viçvajic chakadhūmam bhavāçarvāv ity upadadhīta:* 'Having wiped them, he loads them up (?), while reciting the hymns iii.26 and 27, incantations against serpents; vi.1, praise of Savitar, who guides unerringly; the five hymns vi.3,4,5,6, and 7, prayers to all the gods for protection and guidance: vi.59,93, and 107, imploring protection for the beasts of burden of the caravan; vi.128, the hymn under discussion, a prayer for fair weather; and iv.28, praying Bhava and Çarva to protect man and beast.' Sūtra 14 prescribes certain oblations to be made, *uttamena*, 'with the last hymn,' iv.28.

Sūtra 15 reads, *upottamena suhṛdo brāhmaṇasya çakṛtpiṇḍān parvasv ādhāya çakadhūmaṁ kim adyā 'har iti pṛchati:* 'With the hymn last but one, i. e. vi.128, he places lumps of dung on the limbs of a Brahman friend and asks the *çakadhūma*, "What sort of a day shall we have to-

[1] The stanza calling *çakadhūma* the "first-born light of the stars" is doubtless only a bit of exorbitant praise, a further expansion of the idea of his being "king of the stars."

[2] See Journal Am. Or. Soc., xi.375, and also p. clxx.=Proc. for Oct., 1883.

[3] MS. *sūrya-*.

day?"' Sūtra 16, *bhadraṁ sumaṅgalam iti pratipadyate*, '"A fair day, a very auspicious one," he answers.' And so on.

Our hymn is prescribed once more in the Kāuçika, chapter c., in a *prāyaçcitti* for a moon eclipse, probably on account of the prayer in the third stanza.

5. Observations on the Condition of Hindu Women according to the Mahābhārata; by Prof. Edward W. Hopkins, of Bryn Mawr, Penn.

This paper contained a study of the facts regarding woman's position in India as presented by the direct statements—aphorisms, legal saws, etc.—of the great Epic, and by the tales therein preserved, the results obtained being compared with those given by the Vedic and legal literature. The whole essay embraced the following heads:

I. **1.** General statements regarding women; **2.** Character; **3.** Honor to; **4.** Crimes against; **5.** Social condition, freedom, restraint; **6.** Property of; **7.** As queen, as warrior; **8.** The girl before marriage; **9.** Sale of the girl; **10.** Woman enslaved.

II. **1.** The wife, polygamy, polyandry; **2.** Marriage-rites; **3.** Relation of wife to husband, duty, obedience, guarding, adultery, levirate-marriage; **4.** Wife's property; **5.** Divorce; **6.** General remarks.

III. The mother, power of, etc.

IV. The widow.

I. **1.** The necessity of distinguishing between the sayings found in the Epic and the acts therein recounted was pointed out. The latter often contradict the former. A sketch was given of that which we can postulate as the probable position of women in Vedic times, and this was then compared with her position at the Epic period. Between the unmarried woman and the wife a sharp distinction must be drawn, if we would understand woman's true position; also between Āryan and un-Āryan women; also between women of different localities—especially between the 'northern barbarians' and the 'southerners,' the 'northern Kurus' and the 'middle (?) Kurus.' **2.** Misogyny has apparently a historical growth, to be traced in the remarks regarding women in the earlier and the later literature in general, and in the old and the new parts of the Epic. They whose wives least deserve it are, in India, most prone to speak slightingly of woman and wife. Γνῶμαι from the earlier books were contrasted with those from the twelfth and thirteenth. Compare especially: xiii.38.1 ff.; xii.213.7; xii.33.45; xiii.48. 36 ff.; 46.8 ff.; xiv.90.13; xii.81.56; iii.150.49; v.38.42; iii.71.6; etc. **3.** The Hindu idea of honor to women was discussed.

4. The laws of *vadha* and theft of women; probability of a historical reminiscence in the special laws 'given to the barbarians' (old signification of *dasyu* often preserved). **5.** Tales of a time when women were not guarded (*anāvṛtāḥ striyaḥ sarvā narāç ca*, iii.307.15: *anāvṛtāḥ . . purā striya āsan*, i.122.3 ff. etc.) were compared with the events in the main story, and contrasted with the formal laws requiring such guarding; these laws, again, were compared with the Dharmasūtra; the result was drawn that the Epic story represents more the Vedic free-

dom; an attempt was made to show at what period the strict rules began. **6.** Property, originally none; gradual growth of property-right was discussed; mainly treated under wife.

7. *Strīrājya* (iii.51.23), 'woman as ruler' (*anuçāsitā*, v.38.43), and the like vague references prove nothing for woman's right to rule. Such cases may have been heard of, but were not admitted as Āryan. A minute examination of the Çikhaṇḍī legend was made; Holtzmann's view that Arjuna sheltered himself behind Çikhaṇḍī was criticized (cf. vi.19.19; 22.3). It was doubtfully questioned whether we have not here a genuine reminiscence of a woman warrior, she being openly recognized as such in spite of the fable *yathā 'bhavac ca strī pūrvaṁ paçcāt puṁstvaṁ samāgataḥ* (vi.107.81). **8.** Time of marriage was given as uncertain; the terms of the law correspond only to the later parts of the Epic. The kind of girl that one should marry is the same as that recommended in the law. Attention was called here and again to the unanimity of the Dharmasūtras with the later Epic.

9. Sale of the girl by *Çulka* was discussed; we must here separate customs geographically; this is intimated by the Epic itself. In this regard we probably have no right to say for any one period 'the Hindus had this or that custom;' *kulāni*, 'gentes,' contemporary, but geographically sundered, are alone to be considered. All generalizations fail till we come to the late time represented by the last additions to the Epic. **10.** Slave-selling was forbidden in general (xiii.44.47); women were enslaved by gambling (*dyūte jitāsi kṛtāsi dāsī*, ii.67.34) or by war. In the latter case there was a year's respite for the girl (xii.96.15). The law was probably stricter than the usage.

II. **1.** While polygamy extends from Vedic times onward, the legal qualifications of secondary wives are never the same; there is no fixed rule regarding marital connection between high-caste men and low-caste women. Probably they were always held as concubines; not till late did any claim arise for their legal rights. Hindu polygamy in the epic period, early or late, is practically monogamy plus concubinage. The women became nominally as well as virtually concubines the moment a true wife was wedded. 'The word *dārā*,' it is said, 'has very different meanings.' Polyandry pure and simple is not proved by Vedic or Epic literature. At most we have only the possibility of some such institution in the Veda; it must have been at that time a mere reminiscence. Whether a limited polyandry did not really exist near enough to Vedic and early Epic times to survive as tradition is not absolutely proved, but the main tale of the Epic and minor tales in it seem to confirm this opinion. It should perhaps be termed rather phylogamy, as in each case the wife marries several brothers. A passage from the legal literature was pointed out as a further indication that the woman was possibly married to the family. But the marriage of one woman to several unrelated men is neither proved nor indicated. The formal statement of the Epic is that 'polyandry is opposed to the world and the Veda,' since 'many men for one woman is a thing unheard of,' i.195.27, though the cases 'heard of' are subsequently given.

2. Marriage-forms. The chief point here was the establishment of a

terminus ab quo to the form of marriage called *svayaṁvara* or 'self-choice.' Reasons were given for objecting to the popular idea that this is a very old custom. The writer held that it appertains to the time of the advanced Epic, and was a *kṣatriya*, or particularly royal, development of a simpler marriage-form; he made the suggestion, based on some support from the Epic, that this might have been what the law calls the *prājāpatya*. **3.** All passages were collected, but no new result obtained: the wife is the husband's chief care; the husband, the wife's divinity. Some differences of custom were noted; another interesting variant to the *khādayet* of Manu (viii.371) and the *ghātayet* of Gāutama occurs at xii.165.64, *çvabhis tām ardayet*.

4. The property of the wife was fixed by the later portion of the Epic. A correspondence here between the late Epic and the late Law was shown. Apropos of the much-disputed *nirhāra* of Manu ix.199, we find at xiii.47.23–25 *nāpahāraṁ striyaḥ kuryuḥ*. The wife's property may not legally exceed 'three thousand' when inherited from her husband. She shares the rest with his (sons or) relations.

5. Divorce was permitted under different names. The evidence of this is not historical, i. e. based on tales narrated as facts in the Epic, but rather aphoristic. The general rule is, *na patnīṁ vihareta*, xii.269. 27, comment, *vibhajeta*. Compare ii.5.11 of the Dharmasūtra of Āpastamba. **6.** General remarks followed on woman's suicide; on the word for 'kiss,' √*ghrā* + *ā*, lit. 'smell at;' on Hindu goddess-worship, etc.

III. The mother. Her power and venerableness are fully up to the old standard—so far as we can judge from the words and the occurrences of the Epic. Nominally, at least, she is exalted to the rank of a divinity. If she dies, her representative is the eldest sister among her children, or the eldest brother's wife.

IV. The widow. Some new examples were adduced to show how unfamiliar widow-burning, as a general custom, appeared to the writers of even the later Epic. The king is enjoined to support widows, etc.; and frequent allusions are made to widows in all ranks. Second husbands were not looked upon as unusual, although as somewhat reprehensible.

It was pointed out, finally, that the general assertions of the foregoing discussion were subject to certain caste-limitations.

6. On Avestan Similes. I. Similes from the Realm of Nature; by Dr. A. V. Williams Jackson, of Columbia College, New York City.

This paper was intended as an introduction to further studies on the subject. After some general statements in regard to the similes, it first called attention to their comparative frequency throughout the Avesta, with the marked and interesting exception, however, of the Gāthā portion of the literature. The Avestan similes, it was then noted, are drawn (*a*) from the realm of nature, (*b*) from animals and their actions, and (*c*) from man and his relations in daily life; and in addition to direct similes there are found a number of indirect or implied comparisons, while words used metaphorically are not infrequent. The form

and character of the simile were next discussed, and the theory was advanced that the similes, even in the midst of prose passages, seem in general to be capable of metrical reconstruction. Exceptions to this rule were noted and reasons suggested therefor.

The first division of the subject was then taken up in detail, showing that the Avesta derives many of its similes from the realm of nature, as the natural phenomena—the winds, clouds, rains, and fires—are all made to form the groundwork of a comparison. The terrestrial objects, moreover, as the sea, river, mountain, the tree, grass, grain, and stone, furnish each an image; and points of resemblance are sought also from the earth, sky, sun, moon, and stars.

The action (1) of the wind, it was shown, appears in a simile in the following passages, Vd. iii.42=viii.30, Afr. iii.6, Ys. lvii.28, and (?) Yt. xviii.5; (2) of the rains in Ys. lvii.28; (3) of the clouds at Ys. ix.32, Yt. xiv.41, and also Ys. lvii.28. These passages were commented on, and metrical reconstructions proposed. (4) The fire was the next element noticed; it occurs in three places, Ys. lxxi.8, Yt. xxiii.6, xxiv.4; partial parallels from Rig Veda vi.18.10, iv.4.4, v.87.6-7, i.112.17, were cited.

The comparisons drawn from terrestrial objects, (5) the sea Vourukasha in Vd. v.23, and (6) from the rivers, Vd. v.24, Yt. viii.24; Ys. lx.4=Yt. xiii.32, and Ys. lxv.3=Yt. v.3, xiii.6, were also examined in particular. The Yasna and Yasht passages here quoted, however, are implied similes rather than real, but reasons were given for including them; and the question of the compound adjectives *zemfrathaṅh*, *dānudrājaṅh*, *hvarebarezaṅh*, each equivalent to a simile, was discussed with some fullness. (7) The mountains, it was further remarked, are used figuratively in Yt. viii.24. The simile derived (8) from a tree, Vd. v.24, and the image from the fading (9) of the grass, Vd. ix.46, were next examined, a metrical reconstruction being suggested also for the latter passage. Further, *yavōfrathaṅh* at Vd. xix.19 was regarded as an adjective of measure drawn (10) from the size of a grain, and equivalent to our 'thick as a barley-corn;' while (11) a stone, used as a weapon, was quoted in a simile at Yt. xvii.20. A comparison (12) from the size of the earth itself, Ys. xix.7=Ys. lxxi.15, was next taken up, and it was shown how the passage may be considered metrical. In this connection the adjective *zemfrathaṅh*, equivalent to a simile in Yt. x.44, as well as in Ys. lx.4=Yt. xiii. 32 already spoken of, was recalled.

Passing from the realm of earth to the celestial regions, a simile undoubtedly drawn (13) from the sky was shown to exist in Vd. v.25, and the metrical defect in the passage it was proposed to remedy by reading,

yatha (hāu asma) imām zām
āca pairica bavāva,

the pronoun also being supplied with *asma*, to bring out the antithesis, as so frequently in the Old Persian Inscriptions *imām bumīm*, *avam asmānam*, the Skt. *asāú dyāús*, *iyám pṛthivī́*, and particularly in Yt. xiii.2, after which the passage is modeled. (14) The sun as affording an image at Yt. x.118, Ys. lx.4=Yt. xiii.32; (15) the moon at Yt. xxiii.6,

xxiv.4, x.142; and (16) the stars as occurring in Yt. x.143, (?) xviii.5, gave passages that were specially treated.

In conclusion it was noted that the ancient Iranians were appreciative observers of nature, and had chosen similes from this realm to illustrate some of their noblest thoughts.

7. On a Modern Nestorian MS. Ecclesiastical Calendar; by Prof. I. H. Hall.

Among the objects brought back by Dr. Ward from the journey of the "Wolfe Expedition" is an Ecclesiastical table, written in Syriac, in modern Nestorian hand and ink, but obtained at Mardîn. Some Nestorians now in New York tell me that they have seen others like it; but they themselves do not understand it; nor can they tell me anything respecting its use. One of these Nestorians, the Rev. James Doonan, said also that the handwriting closely resembles that of his teacher ܩܫܝܫܐ ܐܘܫܢܐ, or Priest Ausha'na of Oroomiah, whom he had seen writing similar calendars. It consists of 29 pages, of which 28 form one continuous table, in which the headings or arguments are repeated with each page. This long table gives the fasts and feasts, and other matters ecclesiastical and chronological, for two grand cycles of the sun and moon; or for every year of the *Enneakaidodekaëteris*, beginning with the first year of the 14th cycle of 532 years. The specimen page here given (translated) shows the arrangement of the table. At the right hand are seen the names of the festivals, etc.; and from right to left, in the horizontal lines, run the dates for the several years, of which those belonging to cycle 14 occupy the last line but one, and those in cycle 15, the last line. As there are 19 years in the lunar cycle (or in each page), 28 pages make 28 × 19=532, or the complete solar and lunar cycle. The table begins with the Alexandrine year 1737 and ends with 2800; the years of cycle 14 running from 1737 to 2268, and those of cycle 15 from 2269 to 2800. Of course the dates in the lowest row differ from those in the next above (each respectively) by 532; and, also of course, the table might be extended indefinitely earlier and later by adding more rows of years, arranging them after the same rule. The specimen page was taken at random. It is to be noted that, since these cycles began at the creation of the world, we obtain (by computing backwards, and reducing to the Christian era), as the date of that event, the 1st October, B. C. 5492.

In general, the use of this table is clear. It gives the month and the day of the month upon which occur, severally, the Presentation in the temple, the festivals of Moses, Elias, *Nûsardîl*, Pentecost, Ascension, Easter, Sunday before Lent begins, Rogation, and Annunciation. Only we should reverse this order, since the year runs that way, and these pages are to be read from the bottom up, and from the last page to the first, as well as from right to left. For the other festivals, except Good Friday, the number gives the day of the week (Sunday=1, Monday=2, etc.). The "Foundation" gives the day of the week of the beginning of the year, or rather, directly the last day of the preceding year. In the Oriental calendars which begin with January 1, the "foundation"

31 T.	1 T.	2 T.	3 T.	5 T.	6 T.	30 T.	31 T.	1 T.	3 T.	4 T.	5 T.	30 T.	1 T.	2 T.	3 T.	4 T.	30 T.	31 Tishri.	Presentation [at the Temple].
25 T.		18 T.	26 T.	6 T.	15 T.		8 T.	18 T.		14 T.	2 T.		18 T.	26 T.	6	21 T.		10 Tishri.	Moses.
3	2	1	7	6	4	3	2	1	6	5	4	3	1	7	6	5	3	2	The Cross.
3 I.	12 I.	30 A.	7 I.	18 A.	27 A.	11 I.	22 A.	3 A.	15 I.	26 A.	3 I.	8 I.	30 A.	7 I.	18 A.	2 I.	11 Ilûl.	22 Ab.	Elias.
3	1	7	6	5	3	2	1	7	5	4	3	2	7	6	5	4	2	1	Mary.
16 T.	25 T.	12 T.	20 T.	30 T.	9 T.	24 T.	4 T.	12 T.	28 T.	8 T.	16 T.	31 T.	12 T.	20 T.	30 T.	15 T.	24 T.	4 Tammuz.	Nûsardel.
28 I.	6 H.	24 I.	1 H.	12 I.	21 I.	5 H.	16 I.	24 I.	9 H.	20 I.	28 I.	12 H.	24 I.	1 H.	12 I.	27 I.	5 Heziran.	16 Iyyar.	Pentecost.
18 I.	27 I.	14 I.	22 I.	2 I.	11 I.	26 I.	6 I.	14 I.	30 I.	10 I.	18 I.	2 I.	14 I.	22 I.	2 I.	17 I.	26 I.	6 Iyyar.	Ascension.
2	7	6	5	4	2	1	7	6	4	3	2	1	6	5	4	3	1	7	George.
9 N.	18 N.	5 N.	13 N.	24 A.	2 N.	17 N.	28 A.	5 N.	21 N.	1 N.	9 N.	24 N.	5 N.	13 N.	24 N.	8 N.	17 Nisan.	28 Adar.	Resurrection [Easter].
20 Sh.	28 Sh.	15 Sh.	23 Sh.	4 Sh.	12 Sh.	27 Sh.	7 Sh.	16 Sh.	3 Sh.	11 Sh.	19 Sh.	6 Sh.	15 Sh.	23 Sh.	3 Sh.	19 Sh.	27 Sh.	7 Shobat.	[Sunday before] Lent.
31 C.	8 Sh.	26 C.	3 Sh.	15 C.	23 Sh.	7 Sh.	18 C.	27 C.	11 Sh.	22 C.	30 C.	15 Sh.	25 C.	3 Sh.	14 C.	30 C.	7 Shobat.	18 Canûn.	Rogation.
7	8	6	7	4	5	8	5	6	8	5	6	9	6	7	4	6	8	5	Good Friday.
5	4	3	2	6	6	5	4	2	1	7	6	4	3	2	1	6	5	4	Epiphany.
7	6	5	4	2	1	7	6	4	3	2	1	6	5	4	3	1	7	6	Nativity.
28 T.	29 T.	30 T.	1 C.	3 C.	27 T.	28 T.	29 T.	1 C.	2 C.	3 C.	27 T.	29 T.	30 T.	1 C.	2 C.	27 T.	28 T.	29 Tishri.	Annunciation.
6 5	4	3	2	1 7	6	5	4	3 2	1	7	6	5 4	3	2	1	7 6	5	4	"Foundation."
19 6:6	18 3:17	17 5:29	16 2:9	15 4:21	14 1:1	13 5:12	12 7:24	11 4:4	10 1:15	9 3:27	8 7:7	7 4:18	6 6:30	5 3:10	4 5:22	3 2:2	2 6:13	1 1:25	"Changes."
2211	2209	2208	2207	2206	2206	2205	2204	2203	2202	2201	2200	2199	2198	2197	2196	2195	2194	2193	Years cycle 14.
2743	2742	2741	2740	2739	2738	2737	2736	2735	2734	2733	2732	2731	2730	2729	2728	2727	2726	2725	Years cycle 15.

In "years cycle 14," from the second 2206–2209, the number is one too small, by scribe's error. In line "Presentation," T. stands for Tishri; as also in lines "Moses" and "Annunciation." In "Elias," A. stands for Ab, I. for Ilûl. In "Nûsardel," T. stands for Tammuz. In "Pentecost" and "Ascension," I. stands for Iyyar, H. for Heziran. In "Resurrection," A. stands for Adar, N. for Nisan. In "Annunciation," C. stands for Canûn. There are sundry mistakes in the (whole) table, but it is scarcely worth while to make a note of them.

numbers are the "*numeri concurrentes,*" which were supplanted later by the Dominical Letters (being, with them, the supplement of 7 [or 8]). The line called "Changes" has three numbers, written closely in one line, but here the first is placed above for convenience. Its second number gives the dates of the new moons in Tishri I., or October; and not, as might be guessed, the date of the Easter new moons. The first number in this line is merely the number of the year in the lunar cycle of 19 years. This line is the same on all the 28 pages. The second number of this line appears to give the so-called *terminos paschales* (*Ostergrenzen*, Easter-limits); i. e. the date of the full moon that determines Easter—omitting, for brevity, the name of the month. Thus 25 means the 25th Adar; 13, the 13th Nisan; 2, the 2d Nisan, and so on. The third number of this row is the *number concurrent* (x) with the day of the Easter full moon, which serves to determine the day of the week of the latter, by combination with the "foundation" (f). Add f and x, and you have the week day (counting Sunday as 1, Monday 2, etc.) of the *terminus paschalis.* The next Sunday after this is Easter. To illustrate, taking, as sufficient, the first six places in the row:

Numbers (x), . . .	1	6	2	5	3	6
Foundation (f) . .	4	5	7	1	2	3
Sum; adding and subtracting 7 from the sum when necessary:	5, or Thursd.	4, or Wed.	2, or Mond.	6, or Friday.	5, or Thursd.	2, or Mond.
Making days till Sunday:	3	4	6	2	3	6
Add the date of *term. pasch.* (2d number in row):	25 Nisan.	13 Nisan.	2 Nisan.	22 Nisan.	10 Nisan.	30 Adar.
And we have the date of Easter Sunday:	28 Nisan.	17 Nisan.	8 Nisan.	24 Nisan.	13 Nisan.	5 Nisan.

Or, to be a little more intelligible, this row of "Changes" gives exactly what is in the little table of the Williams MS. (which was printed in the Proceedings for October, 1885), together with the numbers of the years (which in the Williams MS. are marked by the position of the small table under the large one); but this now omits the names of the months, which are given in the Williams MS. table.

The row with the title "Good Fridays" appears to show how many *entire* weeks have passed from the beginning of the year till Good Friday, the Friday before Easter—or rather, as the number of weeks is always more than 20, it gives the number over 20, and leaves the 20 number to be understood. I do not deem it necessary to add illustrations to facilitate the computation. If any one chooses to verify, he will find it easy. The mistakes of the scribe who wrote the table will not be found numerous enough to mislead. At the same time, the tables are not written with extreme care; and perhaps the table was computed from lunar elements that differ slightly from those used in the other, to be presently described.

I should also add, that, for solving most of the puzzling things, especially that presented in the row of Good Fridays, and in the row of "changes," I am indebted to Dr. C. H. F. Peters, of the Litchfield Observatory of Hamilton College. Also, it seems to me that the lexicons

need to add something in their definitions of the word ܗܦܟܬܐ. It here stands, in the plural, for the *terminos paschales*, and can mean nothing else. No definition in any of the lexicons will fit; much less any that has been suggested by any of my linguistically learned friends. Of course, through the scientific and technical channel hinted at above, the derivation of this meaning is natural enough from the regular Syriac root; but the hint of a scientific man, who saw at once through the application of the term, and judged it from his own view-point outside of the Syriac, suggested a transliteration of the Greek *ἔπακτα;* which alone would have a strong favorable color.

Respecting the feast *Nûsardîl* or *Nûsardel*, it is the Nestorian name for the first Sunday of ecclesiastical summer, or the seventh Sunday after Pentecost; which, in the common Syrian lesson-tables, is called "of the blessed apostles," or simply, "of the apostles." But for a full account, see R. Payne Smith's *Thesaurus Syriacus*, 2326.

The "Rogation" or "Supplication" in the calendar is not the same time ast hat of the Roman church. In the latter, "Rogation" is the three days preceding Ascension. In the calendar, it is a feast twenty days before the "Sunday before Lent," or 69 days before Easter, and therefore always on a Monday.

Interesting is the arrangement of feasts by periods of seven weeks. Lent Sunday ("*Dimanche gras*") is 49 days or seven weeks before Easter. Pentecost is 49 days or seven weeks after Easter. Nûsardîl is 98 days or twice seven weeks after Easter. Elijah is 147 days, or thrice seven weeks after Easter. Moses is 49 days after Elijah, or four times seven weeks after Easter.

The calendar contains a number of mistakes in its body. Thus, on the first page of the calendar are the following errata:

Year 1741, line "Elijah," *for* 10 Ab *read* 10 Ilûl.
" 1748, " "Nûsardîl," *for* 17 *read* 27.
" 1753, " "Pentecost," *for* 4 Heziran *read* 20 Iyyar.
" 1752, " " *for* 15 Iyyar *read* 4 Heziran.
" 1751, " " *for* 24 Iyyar *read* 15 Iyyar.
" 1741, " "Ascension," *for* 13 Iyyar *read* 25 Iyyar.
" 1740, " " *for* 25 Iyyar *read* 5 Iyyar.
" 1739, " " *for* 5 Iyyar *read* 13 Iyyar.
" 1744, " "Easter," *for* 22 Nisan *read* 12 Nisan.
" " " "Fast" (Lent), *for* 12 Shobat *read* 22 Shobat.
" 1745, " "Rogation," *for* 8 Canûn *read* 18 Canûn.
" 1742, " " *for* 22 Shobat *read* 22 Canûn.

The other table, of one page, needs scarcely more description than will appear from the following translation of it. It is a table to find the new moon, or the beginning of the lunar month, for any time in the Alexandrine calendar. Below the table is the arithmetical rule and explanation, of which the translation is here given.

This table is explained in the rule appended. It contains, however, a great many mistakes. According to the periods adopted by the Church, 19 Julian years=235 synodical months: i. e.=6939¾ days. Hence 1 synodical month=$29^{d}.53$. Instead of this exact number, 29½ days was taken as the number for finding the "golden numbers," adding alternately

29 and 30 days. The remaining fraction was provided for by the "*saltus lunæ*," whose position in the cycle according to the Alexandrine computation differed from that of the Roman. Beginning, therefore, from 19 Tishri I upwards in the first right hand column, we find the dates that follow by adding alternately 29 and 30, and having regard to the days of the month. Another check is the following: 12 synodical months are, to a small fraction, 11 days shorter than the Julian year. Hence, in any one horizontal line, the difference between two successive numbers (right *minus* left, or right + 29.5) should be 11, or sometimes 10, and only in occasional instances 12.

																										Months.
	9	31:1	12	22	4	15	25	7	18	29	10	21	2	13	24	6	17	27	9	Ilûl.
21		5	13	24	6	16	27	8	20	30:1	12	22	4	16	26	7	18	29	10	Ab.
22		4	15	25	7	18	28	10	21	2	13	23	5	16	27	9	20	30:1	12	Tammuz.
23		4	15	26	7	18	29	10	22	3	14	24	6	17	27	9	20	1	12	Heziran.
24		6	17	27	9	21	30:1	13	23	4	15	26	7	18	29	11	22	3	14	Iyyar.
25		6	17	28	9	20	1	12	24	5	16	26	8	18	30	11	22	3	14	Nisan.
26		8	19	29	11	22	3	14	25	6	17	28	9	20	31:1	13	24	5	16	Adar.
25		6	17	28	9	21	1	12	24	5	16	26	8	19		11	25	3	14	Shobat.
26		8	19	29	11	22	3	14	25	6	17	28	9	20	31:1	13	24	5	16	Canûn [2].
28		9	20	31:1	12	23	2	15	27	8	19	29	11	22	3	14	25	6	17	Canûn [1].
28		10	21	2	13	24	2	16	27	9	20	31:1	12	23	4	15	26	7	18	Tishri [2].
29		11	22	3	14	25	6	17	28	10	21	2	13	24	5	16	27	8	19	Tishri [1].
19		**18**	**17**	**16**	**15**	**14**	**13**	**12**	**11**	**10**	**9**	**8**	**7**	**6**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	Numbers.

'In the name of Our Lord, I write a complete computation of the lunar months. If, therefore, you desire to know on what day in the solar month the new moon occurs, take the number of the Alexandrine year that you are seeking, and reject from it one thousand and seven hundred and sixty; and divide the remainder by 19; and take that which remains and enter at the number written in the row of *olaf beth* [i.e., the lowest line] in the table preceding, in the column of *yud* and *teth* [i.e., the perpendicular column corresponding], and go down opposite the number of your remainder; thus [you will find] the beginning of the lunar month, opposite the [name of the] solar month. And if the year be a leap year, when you have passed Shobat, subtract one day from the number of your remainder. And when there are two numbers for the months, marked with two points, in those months there begin two lunar months, at the first and at the last of the month, since ending it changes to the beginning. And pray for me in love.'

Obvious errors in the table are: Line *Ilûl:* col. 19, for 9 read 19; col. 18, for 31:1 read 1 (the month has only 30 days); col. 16, 22 more correct than 23; col. 13, 25 better than 26. Line *Ab:* col. 18, for 5 read 2; also, more correctly: col. 15, for 6 read 5; col. 11, for 20 read 19; col. 9, for 12 read 11; col. 7, for 4 read 3; col. 6, for 16 read 14 or 15. Line *Canûn I:* col. 13, for 2 read 4. *Tishri II:* col. 13, for 2 read 5; col. 8, for 31:1 read 30. *Tishri I:* col. 8, for 2 read 31:2; col. 19, for 29 read 31:1. The table seems to be computed very roughly.

It seems hardly worth while to print entire the other table of the MS., or to append a list of the scribe's errors. In reading the table, the difficulty is much increased by the scribe's habitual omission of the points which distinguish *dolath* from *rish*. Yet in that case there was almost always the check that the one stands for 4, the other for 200, which could not well be mistaken in the connection.

8. Further Inscriptions in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York; all from the Cesnola Collection; by Prof. I. H. Hall.

I. Cypriote Inscriptions.

1. On a gem of soft milky colored stone, $\frac{11}{16} \times \frac{9}{16}$ inch in dimension. Figure of antelope with head turned back, running. Over the hind quarters the character *ti. no.*, $\frac{3}{32}$ inch high, reading, apparently, from right to left. Probably genitive of owner's name Τίνω or Θίνω. On the back of the gem is the figure of an antelope, with the Phœnician star (or sun) and crescent. The star is made of a central disk surrounded by dots.

2. On an amphora of red pottery, 2 feet 5 inches high; $10\frac{1}{2}$ inches greatest diameter; neck 9 inches high; mouth 3 inches inner diameter, $3\frac{7}{8}$ inches outer; handles 8 inches high; shape like the Rhodian amphoræ, but more slim; and a ring around the base. Cypriote letter, 1 inch high, on one handle: *ti*. Maker's mark.

3. Fragment of pottery, vase-handle. Cypriote letter *lo.*, incised before baking. Strokes $\frac{3}{4}$ inch long.

II. Greek Inscriptions.

1. Handle of Rhodian jar. Rectangular stamp (right-hand one), $2 \times \frac{5}{8}$ inches in dimension; impression bad at top, because stamp did not reach the clay throughout. Thick letters, $\frac{1}{4}$ inch high. Reads ΙΕΡΟΚΛΕΥΣ. Maker's or proprietor's name, in the genitive. The same termination of that case appears in other examples.

2. Handle of Rhodian jar (right-hand one). Rectangular stamp, $1\frac{7}{8} \times \frac{5}{8}$ inches in dimension. Letters $\frac{3}{16}$ to $\frac{1}{4}$ inch high. Reads ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΥ. Proprietor's or maker's name, in the genitive.

3. Rhodian jar, 2 feet 6 inches high; greatest diameter 1 foot; neck 11 inches high; handles 1 foot high. Mouth 5 inches outer, 4 inches inner diameter. Circular seals on handles, each with the conventional rose. Stamps $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches extreme diameter. Letters with bases towards the center, or reading from within.

a. Letters $\frac{1}{16}$ to $\frac{1}{8}$ inch high. Stamp only partly impressed, and a gap in the inscription. Reads ΕΠΙ ΕΡΜ . . . . . ΑΜΟΥ ΠΑΝΑΜΟΥ. Eponym, and name of Doric month. The space where the stamp is defective would have held about 5 letters, or possibly 6; but the clay evidently spread or stretched after the impression. A trace of a letter at the beginning of the gap in the second word looks like I, but it is uncertain. Instead of ΜΟΥ, the true reading may be ΝΟΥ, but the stroke needed to make a Μ of the Ν is there, whether by accident or not. Not unlikely the name is ΕΡΜΙΑΝΟΥ, and the trouble made by the stamp's moving during impression.

b. Letters $\frac{3}{16}$ inch high. Badly and only partially impressed. Reads ΕΠΙ ΚΑΣΤΩΛΙ[ΟΥ]. The bracketed letters have traces, but their ending is uncertain. Eponym.

4. On bottom of small handled vase, or pitcher, or cup, but handle broken off. Vessel $2\frac{7}{8}$ inches high, $3\frac{1}{4}$ inches greatest diameter, $2\frac{7}{16}$ inches across top; bottom slightly concave, $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches diameter. Red Roman pottery. On bottom, above, arranged in a curve, reading from the center, the letters ΦΠV. Below, a letter that may be either Μ or Σ;

probably the latter; though its position is so ambiguous that nothing can be decided.

9. On Hebrew Genealogy; by Gen. H. B. Carrington, of the United States Army.

The author illustrated the fact that—given a sequence of long lives—it takes only a very few to bridge over a long space in human history; and that—accepting the figures of the book of Genesis as correct—the lives of five patriarchs span the entire time from the Creation to Abraham. He then adverted to the bearing of this on the life and value of tradition.

10. Note on the proper name Bu-du-ilu; by Dr. Morris Jastrow, Jr., of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

The name of this king of the Ammonites is mentioned by Sennacherib, I.R.38, col. ii.52, and by Esarhaddon, III.R.16, col. v.18. It is read by Schrader, K.A.T.[2] p. 141, and by Delitzsch, *Assyr. Lesestücke*[3], p. xiii.52, as Pu-du-ilu: and it is explained by the former as the equivalent of the Biblical פדהאל of Numbers xxxiv.28. Against this interpretation several objections may be urged. First, we have the name Pa-di-i in the inscription of Sennacherib just cited, line 70; and this, as Schrader, p. 164, also admits, is clearly the Biblical פדיה of II. Kings xxiii.36 and elsewhere; so that we should expect, as a transcription of פדהאל, either Pa-di-ilu or Pa-du-ilu, but not Pu-du-ilu. Secondly, the more usual value of the first cuneiform sign is *bu*. It might, of course, be *pu;* but an examination of the Assyrian transcription of foreign proper names reveals the fact that when ambiguous cuneiform signs are used, they are, as a rule, employed with their more usual value. In proper names, at least, there is not that great freedom in the use of a sign with several phonetic values indifferently, which is elsewhere so characteristic of Assyrian writing. The scribes seldom deviate from this rule, and only perforce.

I would therefore read the name as Bu-du-ilu. In explanation of it, we may observe that there are many Phœnician proper names, originally compounded with עבד, which have become abbreviated in the course of time by the loss of their initial ע. Thus we find בדמלך for עבדמלך; בראשמן for עבראשמן; בדמלכרת for עבדמלכרת; בדבעל for עבדבעל; and other the like; see Schröder, *Phönizische Sprache*, p. 88. In like manner, I take Bu-du-ilu as the equivalent of בראל, and this in turn as a shortened form of עבראל, 'Servant of El.'

There is another Assyrian name which is compounded with בד; and it supports the explanation just given, It is Bu-di-ba-al, and occurs in the great Assurbanipal inscription, V.R., col. ii.83 and 91. The *i* of *Budi-* is probably a connecting-vowel, analogous to that found almost invariably in Ethiopic and very frequently in Hebrew names: thus, Abīṭal, 'Father of dew;' Achinoam, 'Brother of loveliness;' Achimoth, 'Brother of death;' Eliezer, 'God of strength.' Accordingly, Budi-baal corresponds exactly to the above-quoted בדבעל of the Phœnician inscriptions, and means 'Servant of Baal.'

The identity of Budu- and Budi- will hardly be questioned; especially since we find a king of Assyria with the name Bu-di-ilu, mentioned at I.R.6, No. 3*a* and *b*.—As the Greek transcriptions show, the בד of the Phœnician names was pronounced Bōd, and this could be rendered in Assyrian only by B*u*du- or B*u*di-.

The abbreviations cited above have their parallel in the Old Testament also. At I. Samuel xii.11, the name בדן stands for עבדן, and is identical with עבדון of Judges xii.13. Considering the lateness of the Phœnician inscriptions in which these abbreviations are found, it is the more important that an instance occurs in Assyria so early as Sennacherib.

After the presentation of this paper to the Society, the writer's attention was called to a passage in Bezold's new book, *Assyrisch-Babylonische Literatur*, from which it appears that Dr. Jensen also explains Bu-du-ilu as above—a confirmation, which, coming as it does from so high a source, is certainly valuable and welcome.

11. On Assyrian and Samaritan; by Dr. Jastrow.

This paper, embodying the preliminary results of a study of Samaritan in its bearings on Assyrian, aimed to exhibit the light which Samaritan throws on many points of Assyrian Lexicography, and the aid it furnishes for the explanation of some of the phenomena of Assyrian phonology. The following abstract gives a summary of the more important points touched upon.

The stem *êpêšu* is one of the most common in Assyrian, and is as extensively employed as our own English *fix*. Its equivalent in the other Semitic languages has hitherto been sought in vain; but it is found in Samaritan, and the context in which it occurs shows its use to be quite similar to that of the Assyrian. As a verb we meet with it in the Samaritan translation of Genesis iv.21, where the Hebrew תופש כנור ועוגב is rendered עפס וקטרום פלגא[1] (מן). A noun formed from this stem occurs several times in the Samaritan Genesis. The word חיה, in the phrase חית השדה (Gen. ii.19,20; iii.1,14, etc.), is invariably עפיסת ברה or עפיסת חקלה. Similarly החיה in viii.1 is עפיסתה—the ה corresponding to the א in Syriac; so also חיתו (Gen. i.24,30) is עפיסת; and finally, in i.28, חיה by itself is עפיסיה.

From the use of the word in these passages as 'living thing' and also as the translation of תפש 'handle,' it is evident that its use is quite as wide as in Assyrian. If, however, we start from what seems to be the fundamental signification in Assyrian, 'to do' or 'make,' we can easily see how the word came to be used to designate an animal—as 'something made' or 'created.' The Samaritan would correspond exactly to the German *Creatur* or our own *creature*. And bearing in mind the idiomatic use of the Assyrian equivalent in such phrases as *êpêšu pa*,

[1] פלגא is evidently a corruption for *σάλπιγξ* and קטרום is of course *κιθάρα*. My quotations from the Samaritan are taken from Heidenheim's edition of Samaritan texts, *Bibliotheca Samaritana*, vol. i., Leipzig, 1884.

literally 'making mouth,' for 'speaking,' and *êpêšu uzna*, 'hearing,' it is nothing remarkable that 'making the harp' should signify 'handling the harp.' It is possible, moreover, that the Samaritan translator takes the Hebrew word in the literal sense of 'fashioning,' and intentionally designates Jubal as the *inventor* of the two musical instruments there mentioned. However this may be, it will be admitted that we have in the Samaritan עפם the counterpart of the Assyrian stem, and that the two have a similar signification in the two languages.

The Assyrian *talimu*, which is usually rendered 'full-brother,' has hitherto been found only in the dialect of the so-called Targum Jerushalmi, and that in a single passage, Gen. xlix.5, where Simeon and Levi are spoken of as אחין תלמין. From this it follows—since Simeon and Levi are children of the same mother—that the word here also is limited to the signification 'full-brother.' In Samaritan, תלים is a very common term, but is used in the general sense of 'brother' without any distinction as to 'half' or 'full.' It is used interchangeably with אח. Thus in Gen. xlii.8, the brothers of Joseph are spoken of as תלימיו.

Such passages as Gen. xvi.12, ועל פני כל אחיו, and ix.5, in the phrase איש אחיו, and xix.7, where Lot addresses his fellow-citizens of Sodom as אחי 'my brothers,' in all of which the Samaritan has *talîm*, show that any distinction which may once have existed between *âḥ* and *talîm* has disappeared.

The feminine of *talimu*, namely *talimtu*, which has only been found in Assyrian, is in common use in Samaritan; and the passages in Genesis in which תלימת is met with (xx.2; xxiv.30,60; xxv.20; etc.) prove that it has acquired the same general signification as its masculine equivalent. We need therefore not be surprised if we some day find the word in an Assyrian text in a wider sense than the hitherto accepted 'full-brother.'

It may be of interest to note that the Samaritan version translates ותרעינה באחו (xli.2) with תלימו, taking אחו for *aḥîv*—a very curious blunder.

The development of the stem שלם presents an interesting feature in Assyrian. From the signification 'to be complete,' it has given rise, on the one hand, to such derivatives as *šulmu*, 'safety, peace,' *šalimtu*, 'uninjured, intact, whole;' and on the other hand (since 'completing' also involves the idea of 'ending'), to *šalamu*, 'complete one's life' and so 'die,' whence *šalamtu*, 'corpse.' Similarly τελευτᾶν, 'to complete, end, die.'

Now while the cognate languages use the word only in the first sense of 'complete,' i. e. 'safe' or 'perfect,' the Samaritan again agrees with the Assyrian in using the stem in the two-fold sense. Thus in Gen. xx.3, הנך מת, lit. 'Behold thou art dead,' is rendered in the Samaritan version by הנך שלם; and so also in Gen. xxi.16, מות הילד is translated by שלם ילידה. Furthermore the verb גוע 'expire' is invariably given as שלם (Gen. vi.17; xxv.8,17; xxxv.29; xlix.33; etc.). As an instance of its use in the sense of 'perfect and intact,' Gen. xvii.1 may be cited, where תמים is translated by שלם.

The word אבי in the already quoted אבי כל תופש (Gen. iv.21) is translated by ארש. Nouns formed through the addition of an elif seem to be quite common in Samaritan. Thus we have אנקבה for Hebrew נקבה (Gen. vi.19; vii.3); אדם for Hebrew דם, 'blood' (ix.4,5; xxxvii.26,31). The word ארש is a similar formation of רש, which is the same as the common Semitic stem ראש, so that ארש means 'chief, head' or the like.

In the Bilingual vocabulary, II.R.vii.36 ff., we have a series *u-ra-šu*, *a-ra-šu*, *ur-ru-šu*, and lines 42 ff. *ṣubat a-riš-ti*. The ideogram for 'head,' which is used in connection with *u-ra-šu* and *ur-ru-šu*, places it beyond doubt that we have here some derivatives of *rêšu*, which is actually found just above in l. 36. *A-ra-šu* and *arištu*, we may therefore safely conclude, go back to the same root. A further proof, however, that *arištu* stands in a close relation to the idea of 'head, chief' and the like is furnished by II.R.30, No. 1, Rev. l. 22, where the same signs—as in the left column of II.R.vii. l. 42 ff.—are explained by *ṣubat êlitu* (cf. l. 21 *êluti*). Whatever the phrase may mean, *êlitu* can only be from עלה 'high' (cf. l. 14 ff.). But *arištu* is a noun formed exactly like the Samaritan ארו through the addition of elif merely with the feminine-ending; and since *arašu* and *urrušu* are evidently infinitive forms, the one of the simple Kal conjugation, the other a Piel, it follows that the Assyrian had a verb ארש as well. Whether this verb is a denominative or not is another question.

The Hebrew שבועתי 'my oath' (Gen. xxiv.8) is translated by אמי, from the same root which in Assyrian means 'speak,' and whence we have *ammatu*, 'word, promise, command,' and *mamîtu*, 'oath.' The passage in Gen. xix.29, מתוך ההפכה בהפך, is translated by מבנו שלקותה בשלקו, which shows the stem to have a meaning similar to Assyrian *šalaḳu*, 'cut-out, tear open' (cf. Arabic *salaḳu*). The word seems to be a Shafel extension of לקי, which is found in Samaritan, Gen. xix.15,17, as the translation of Hebrew ספה 'perish.'

The word קרבה is used at Gen. xiv.2,8 for Hebrew מלחמה. One of the meanings of *ḳitrubu*—from *ḳarabu*—is 'attack,' so that we have in the Samaritan the counterpart of the Assyrian word.

The weakening of the gutturals is, as we now know, a phenomenon which, far from being limited to Assyrian, is, on the contrary, common to all Semitic languages. On this point they differ only in the extent to which the process has gone on. Arabic forms no exception, as a comparison of modern with classic Arabic shows; it simply stands at one end of the scale, having preserved a greater wealth of guttural sounds than any of its sisters. In the Assyrian this weakening has gone so far that the distinction between alif and hê has entirely fallen away, as also the distinction between the weaker ḥeth (the unpointed ḥa of the Arabic) and the two ayins; very frequently, indeed, the same sign stands for any one of the five consonants. The Mandaic, as Professor Nöldeke conclusively shows (*Mand. Gram.*, p. 58 ff.), does not fall far behind the Assyrian. The Samaritan seems to have gone, if possible, still further than the Assyrian. Here there is absolutely no difference whatever between any of the gutturals.

We meet constantly with examples where a stronger guttural has

been replaced in writing by a weaker one; thus מדנע, for Hebrew מזרח, 'east' (Gen. xii.8; xiii.14); זרה for זרע, 'seed' (Gen. viii.22); עזר is the translation for שוב, 'return,' showing that it is the same as Hebrew חזר; אורע is the translation of דרך, 'way,' and therefore equivalent to אורח, etc. But not only this—the same word is written indifferently with almost any of the guttural letters. Thus we have חגל and עגל as the translation of ראה, 'to see;' איל and חיל, for Hebrew אל, 'god.' For עוד we have חורי—probably an abbreviation of אחורי—side by side with עורי. We find אדלה and ערלה as the rendering of טרם. Also ארפה and ערפה for עהודים, and many more.

It is known that the Hebrew and Arabic 'hand' is in Assyrian *îdu*. In Samaritan, the word for 'hand' is invariably written אד, which leaves no doubt that the pronunciation must have been the same as in Assyrian.

In like manner, the Assyrian *immu* 'day, daylight' has a counterpart in the Samaritan אימם (Gen. viii.22; xxxi.39,40), where again the initial aleph points to an agreement in the pronunciation with the Assyrian. This opens the very important question as to the original sound of the letter jod; perhaps it was an *î*, at least in some cases, in all the Semitic languages. The Assyrian and Samaritan and, we may add, the Syriac (where we also have *îd* and *îmama*), would seem to indicate that such is the fact.

The writer proposes to continue his investigations as the succeeding numbers of the *Bibliotheca Samaritana* appear. The results obtained from a mere fragmentary study of Samaritan literature warrant the conclusion that a thorough and exhaustive study will greatly advance our knowledge of the Assyrian tongue.

After the customary vote of thanks to the Faculty of the Divinity School, the Society adjourned to meet in Boston, May 11, 1887.

Prof. Hall sends the following note respecting the MS. described by him in the Proceedings for May, 1886.

Deserving of public mention is the fact that the text of the Lives of the Prophets in the Philadelphia MS. is the recension which Syriac scholars have been hunting after for a long time, the others known not fitting closely enough. What is probably the Syriac original is extant in British Museum MSS., and also in MSS. known to the American missionaries in Oroomiah. Nestle published so much of the Syriac as included the four major prophets, and that "e tribus codicibus musæi Britannici," but giving no variants. His text shows some variants, but the Greek is a marvelously close translation. The Syriac readily solves some knots caused by the awkwardness of the copyist, confirms my conjecture as to slips, and so on.

Since writing this note I observe that Prof. Fr. Baethgen, of Kiel, in an article in *Zeitschr. f. d. alttestl. Wiss.* describing Sachau MS. no. 131 (which appears to be a copy of that whence came several MSS. in the Union Theol. Seminary, N. Y.), finds the Syriac text, and assumes it to be a translation from the Greek of "Epíphanius of Cyprus." The Syriac copy indeed attributes the treatise to Epiphanius of Cyprus, but the concomitants of the Greek recensions show that it was probably one of the literary remains of Epiphanius of Tyre, in "Hebrew" (i. e. the local Aramaic), which were translated into Greek by Dorotheus.